

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/004,781	12/04/2001	Barbara Bennett	232801-00186-1	7953	
75	7590 11/20/2003		EXAMINER		
Arnold B. Silverman, Esquire Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC			HENDRICKSON, STUART L		
44th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
600 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219			1754		
			DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	net	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Kian	Group Art Unit	· ·
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet b	eneath the con	respondence ac	ldress-
Period for Reply	2			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE	MONTH(S)	FROM THE MA	LING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply find the period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature that the provision of the provision of the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ly within the statutory mexpire SIX (6) MONTHS for the cause the application	inimum of thirty (30) from the mailing dat to become ABANI) days will be considered this communication.	dered timely. ation. 133).
Status \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·
☐ This action is FINAL.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except f accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935.	or formal matters, pr C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 21	osecution as to 3.	the merits is c	losed in · · · · · · ·
Disposition of Claims	•			
Claim(s)	•	is/are pe	nding in the app	lication.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are wi	thdrawn from co	nsideration.
Claim(s) 1-21	······································	is/are all	owed.	
☑ Claim(s) 22, 23, 25-33,35		is/are rej	ected.	
☑ Claim(s) 29, 57		is/are ob	jected to.	
☐ Claim(s)			ect to restriction	or election
Application Papers		requirem		
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on			d. ·	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	ed to by the Examine	r		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				•
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)		٠.		
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119 ((a)(d).		
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:				
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been re-	ceived.	•		
□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been rec	ceived in Application	No	· · ·	
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents				
in this national stage application from the International	Bureau (PCT Rule 17	.2(a))		
*Certified copies not received:	e l'arrier a			•
Attachment(s)				
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s	47 6 16	Interview Summ		
Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892	YM INNO	Notice of Inform		·
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948		Other		· -
Office Ac	tion Summary			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Paper No. -

*U.S. GPO: 2000-472-999/43204

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22, 23, 25-33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amagi et al. 3917806.

Amagi teaches in columns 4 and 8 forming small spherical pitch particles and drying them (ie, forming 'powder'), followed by air infusibilization for 2 hours and carbonization in nitrogen. This differs in not exemplifying the claimed carbonization temperature, however a carbonization at 600 degrees is taught as sufficient. Using 600 degrees is thus an obvious expedient to perform carbonization without utilizing excessive energy to heat. Various sources of carbon are taught, as is hot air which is deemed to contain 'steam' (claim 31) by virtue of the moisture in air.

Claims 27 and 28 are duplicates.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754